

ACCIDENTAL RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION
OF
HUMAN FOOD AND ANIMAL FEEDS:
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

This document is intended to provide guidance. It represents the Agency's current thinking on the above. It does not create or confer any rights for or on any person and does not operate to bind FDA or the public.

Radiation Programs Branch
Division of Mammography Quality and Radiation Programs
Office of Health and Industry Programs

Document issued on :

Comments and suggestions may be submitted at any time for Agency consideration to: Radiation Programs Branch (HFZ-240), Center for Devices and Radiological Health, 1350 Piccard Drive, Rockville, MD 20850. Comments may not be acted upon by the Agency until the document is next revised or updated. For questions regarding the use or interpretation of this guidance document contact Donald Thompson at 301-827-0012 or DLT@cdrh.fda.gov.

Additional Copies: World Wide Web/CDRH home page : <http://www.fda.gov/cdrh>
or CDRH Facts on Demand at 1-800-899-0381 or 301-827-0111, specify number
when prompted for the document shelf number.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
Food and Drug Administration
Center for Devices and Radiological Health
Rockville, MD 20850

97D-0153

GDL 2

ACCIDENTAL RADIOACTIVE CONTAMINATION
OF
HUMAN FOOD AND ANIMAL FEEDS:
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES

Prepared by:

Center for Devices and Radiological Health
Food and Drug Administration

1 GENERAL PROVISIONS

2
3 (a) Applicability.

4
5 The recommendations provide guidance to State and local
6 agencies to aid in emergency response planning and execution
7 of protective actions associated with production, processing,
8 distribution, and use of human food and animal feeds
9 accidentally contaminated with radionuclides. The
10 recommendations do not authorize or apply to deliberate
11 releases of radionuclides which are permitted and limited by
12 general controls and/or terms and conditions stipulated by a
13 regulatory agency.

14
15 (b) Scope.

16
17 The recommendations advise that health risk to the public be
18 averted by limiting the radiation dose received as a result of
19 consumption of accidentally contaminated food. This will be
20 accomplished by: (1) setting limits, called Derived
21 Intervention Levels (DILs) on the radionuclide activity
22 concentration (concentration) permitted in human food, and (2)
23 taking protective actions to reduce the amount of
24 contamination.

1 DILs are limits on the concentrations permitted in human food
2 distributed in commerce. They are established to prevent
3 consumption of undesirable amounts of radionuclides and have
4 units of radionuclide activity per kilogram of food, i.e.
5 becquerels per kilogram, Bq/kg (previously used units -
6 picocuries per kilogram, pCi/kg)³. Comparable limits were not
7 provided in the 1982 FDA recommendations. DILs apply during
8 the first year after an accident. If there is concern that
9 food will continue to be significantly contaminated beyond the
10 first year, the long-term circumstances need to be evaluated
11 to determine whether the DILs should be continued or if other
12 guidance may be more applicable.

13
14 Protective actions would be initiated subject to evaluation of
15 the situation and would continue until, in the absence of the
16 actions, the concentrations remain below the DILs. Protective
17 actions can be taken to:

- 18
19 • avoid or limit, through precautionary measures, the amount
20 of contamination that could become incorporated in human
21 food and animal feeds, or

³ The International System of Units is used throughout this document. Units that were used in previous FDA guidance are shown in parenthesis in the main text of this document as reference points for the reader.

1 correspond to the "intervention levels of dose" consensus values
2 set by international organizations (see Appendix B).

3 Intervention levels of dose are radiation doses at which
4 introduction of protective actions should be considered (ICRP
5 1984b). The FDA guidance retains use of the term Protection
6 Action Guide (PAG) for consistency with U.S. federal and state
7 needs.

8
9 The current nominal estimate for the general population for
10 lifetime total cancer mortality for low-LET (linear energy
11 transfer) ionizing radiation, delivered at low doses and low dose
12 rates, is 4.5×10^{-3} for a reference dose equivalent in the whole
13 body of 100 mSv (10 rem) (CIRRPC 1992). For 5 mSv (0.5 rem)
14 committed effective dose equivalent (the recommended PAG) the
15 associated lifetime total cancer mortality would be 2.25×10^{-4}
16 or approximately 1 in 4400.⁶ For comparison, the estimate of the
17 normal lifetime total cancer mortality in the United States for
18 the general population, not associated with additional radiation
19 dose from ingestion of contaminated food from an accident, is
20 0.19 or approximately 1 in 5 (CIRRPC 1992). For example, in a
21 general population of 10,000 individuals, each receiving a
22 committed effective dose equivalent of 5 mSv (0.5 rem), the
23 number of cancer deaths over the lifetimes of the individuals

⁶ The alternate PAG of 50 mSv (5 rem) committed dose equivalent to a specific tissue or organ is always associated with a lifetime cancer mortality for the specific tissue that is as limiting or in some cases more limiting than the lifetime total cancer mortality associated with the PAG of 5 mSv (0.5 rem) for committed effective dose equivalent.

1 could increase in theory by about 2 cancer deaths, that is from
2 the normal number of 1900 to 1902.

3
4 The numerical estimate of cancer deaths presented above for the
5 recommended PAG of 5 mSv (0.5 rem) was obtained by the practice
6 of linear extrapolation from the nominal risk estimate for
7 lifetime total cancer mortality for the general population at 100
8 mSv (10 rem) dose equivalent in the whole body. Other methods of
9 extrapolation to the low-dose region could yield higher or lower
10 numerical estimates of cancer deaths. Studies of human
11 populations exposed at low doses are inadequate to demonstrate
12 the actual magnitude of risk. There is scientific uncertainty
13 about cancer risk in the low-dose region below the range of
14 epidemiological observation, and the possibility of no risk
15 cannot be excluded (CIRRPC 1992).

16 17 DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS

18
19 A DIL corresponds to the concentration in food present throughout
20 the relevant period of time that, in the absence of any
21 intervention, could lead to an individual receiving a radiation
22 dose equal to the PAG, or in international terms, the
23 intervention level of dose. The equation given below is the
24 basic formula for computing DILs.⁷

⁷ In the previous system of units DIL would be in units of pCi/kg, intervention level of dose in units of mrem and DCs in units of mrem/pCi.

$$\text{DIL (Bq/kg)} = \frac{\text{PAG (mSv)}}{f \times \text{Food Intake (kg)} \times \text{DC (mSv/Bq)}}$$

Where:

DC = Dose coefficient; the radiation dose received per unit of activity ingested (mSv/Bq).

f = Fraction of the food intake assumed to be contaminated.

Food Intake = Quantity of food consumed in an appropriate period of time (kg).

The FDA DILs provide a large margin of safety for the public because each DIL is set according to a conservatively safe scenario for the most vulnerable group of individuals (see Appendix D). In addition, protective action would be taken if radionuclide concentrations were to reach or exceed a DIL at any point in time, even though such concentrations would need to be sustained throughout the relevant extended period of time for the radiation dose to actually reach the PAG. In practice, when FDA DILs are used, radiation doses to the vast majority of the affected public would be very small fractions of the PAG. As a result, future adjustments in the absolute values of the PAGs would not necessarily require proportionate modifications in the DILs. Any modification of the DILs would depend on a review of all aspects of the conservatively safe scenario and how the DILs are applied.

1 Food with concentrations below the DILs is permitted to move in
2 commerce without restriction. Food with concentrations at or
3 above the DILs is not normally permitted into commerce. However,
4 State and local officials have flexibility in whether or not to
5 apply restrictions in special circumstances, such as permitting
6 use of food by a population group with a unique dependency on
7 certain food types.

8
9 (a) Use of Derived Intervention Levels for Food Monitoring
10 after the Chernobyl Accident

11
12 Developments in the U.S.

13
14 Following the Chernobyl accident in 1986, a task group of
15 representatives from FDA and the Food Safety and Inspection
16 Service (FSIS) of the United States Department of Agriculture
17 established DILs for application to imported foods under their
18 respective regulatory control. The FDA DILs were called
19 "Levels of Concern" (LOCs) (FDA 1986a, 1986b) and the FSIS DILs
20 were called "Screening Values." Food containing
21 concentrations below the LOCs and Screening Values was allowed
22 to be imported into the U.S.

23
24 FDA LOCs were derived from the 1982 Preventive PAGs and used
25 the following assumptions:

- 1 • the entire intake of food would be contaminated,
- 2
- 3 • I-131 could be a major source of radiation dose for only 60
- 4 60 days following the accident, and
- 5
- 6 • Cs-134 + Cs-137 could be a major source of radiation dose
- 7 for up to one year.
- 8

9 The LOCs provided such a large margin of safety that
10 derivation of LOCs for other radionuclides, judged to be of
11 less health significance, was considered unnecessary.

12
13 The FSIS Screening Value for I-131 was the same as the FDA LOC
14 for I-131 in infant foods. The FSIS Screening Value for
15 Cs-134 + Cs-137 initially differed from the FDA LOC because
16 the FSIS assumed that only meat and poultry (not 100% of the
17 diet) would be contaminated (USDA 1986a). In November 1986,
18 the FSIS changed the Screening Value for Cs-134 + Cs-137 to be
19 the same as the FDA LOC (USDA 1986b, Engel et al 1989). The
20 FDA and FSIS DILs for the Chernobyl accident contamination in
21 imported food after November 1986 are given in Table 1.

22
23 The food monitoring results from FDA and others following the
24 Chernobyl accident support the conclusion that I-131, Cs-134
25 and Cs-137 are the principal radionuclides that contribute to
26 radiation dose by ingestion following a nuclear reactor

Table 1

FDA AND FSIS DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS FOR IMPORTED FOOD
AFTER THE CHERNOBYL ACCIDENT, Bq/kg (pCi/kg)

<u>Radionuclide</u>	<u>FDA LOC</u>		<u>FSIS Screening Value</u>
	<u>Infant Food</u>	<u>Other Food</u>	<u>Meat and Poultry</u>
I-131	55 (1500)	300 (8000)	55 (1500)
Cs-134 + Cs-137	370 (10,000)	370 (10,000)	370 (10,000)

accident, but that Ru-103 and Ru-106 also should be included (see Appendix C). Also, use of DILs was shown to be a practical way to control the radiation dose from ingestion of food that has been contaminated as a result of a nuclear reactor accident.

International Activities

Efforts by international organizations to develop DILs have been extensive. Derivations have been based on the consensus value for the intervention level of dose, and have been for application within individual countries and in international trade. Each of the various international organizations selected values for the components in the basic formula for

1 computing DILs, and each introduced additional judgments to
2 arrive at its recommended DILs. As a result, the DILs
3 recommended by the various organizations differed. The DILs
4 adopted by the Commission of European Communities (CEC) for
5 use in future accidents and those adopted by the Codex
6 Alimentarius (CODEX) for use in international trade⁸ are
7 presented in Appendix F.

8
9 (b) Recommended Derived Intervention Levels

10
11 In these recommendations, FDA uses the term Derived
12 Intervention Level (DIL), which is consistent with
13 international usage. DIL is equivalent to, and replaces the
14 previous FDA term Level of Concern (LOC).

15
16 The recommended DILs are for radionuclides expected to deliver
17 the major portion of the radiation dose from ingestion during
18 the first year following an accident. The DILs are for
19 accidental releases of radionuclides from large nuclear
20 reactors and for other radiological emergencies where there is
21 a possibility of accidental radioactive contamination of human
22 food. The approach provides the flexibility necessary to
23 respond to special circumstances that may be unique to a

⁸ An application of the CODEX DILs can be found in the International Atomic Energy Agency's (IAEA) interim edition of its basic safety standards for protection against ionizing radiation (IAEA 1994). IAEA based its "generic action levels for foodstuffs," found in Schedule V of IAEA 1994, on CODEX DILs.

1 particular accident. A summary of the considerations in
2 selecting DILs is given in this section, with a more detailed
3 explanation available in Appendix D.

4
5 The types of accidents and the principal radionuclides for
6 which the DILs were developed are:

- 7
8 • nuclear reactors (I-131; Cs-134 + Cs-137; Ru-103 +
9 Ru-106),
10
- 11 • nuclear fuel reprocessing plants (Sr-90; Cs-137; Pu-239 +
12 Am-241),
13
- 14 • nuclear waste storage facilities (Sr-90; Cs-137; Pu-239 +
15
- 16 • nuclear weapons (i.e., dispersal of nuclear material
17 without nuclear detonation) (Pu-239), and
18
- 19 • radioisotope thermoelectric generators (RTGs) and
20 radioisotope heater units (RHUs) used in space vehicles
21 (Pu-238).
22

23 The radionuclides listed are expected to be the predominant
24 contributors to radiation dose through ingestion.⁹ Several

⁹ A discussion of the principal radionuclides for an accident at a nuclear reactor is given in Appendix C.

1 radionuclides could be released by an accident at a nuclear
2 reactor, a nuclear fuel processing plant or a nuclear waste
3 storage facility, while only the specific radionuclide used in
4 a nuclear weapon or a space vehicle would be released in that
5 type of accident. When more than one radionuclide is
6 released, the relative contribution that a radionuclide makes
7 to radiation dose from ingestion of subsequently contaminated
8 food depends on the specifics of the accident and the mode of
9 release (NRC 1975, DOE 1989, EPA 1977).

10
11 In unique circumstances, such as transportation accidents,
12 other radionuclides may contribute radiation doses through the
13 food ingestion pathway. These situations are not specifically
14 treated in these recommendations. An evaluation of the
15 radiation dose from ingestion of these other radionuclides
16 should be performed, however, to determine if the PAGs would
17 be exceeded. FDA should be notified during such an
18 evaluation.

19
20 DILs were calculated for the nine radionuclides noted above.
21 For each radionuclide, DILs were calculated for six age groups
22 using Protective Action Guides, dose coefficients, and dietary
23 intakes relevant to each radionuclide and age group. The age
24 groups included 3 months, 1 year, 5 years, 10 years, 15 years
25 and adult (>17 years). The dose coefficients used were from
26 ICRP Publication 56 (ICRP 1989).

1 The DILs were based on the entire diet¹⁰ for each age group,
2 not for individual foods or food groups. The calculation
3 presumed that contamination would occur in thirty percent of
4 the dietary intake. The value of thirty percent was based on
5 the expectation that normally less than ten percent of the
6 annual dietary intake of most members of the population would
7 consist of contaminated food. An additional factor of three
8 was applied to account for limited sub-populations that might
9 be more dependent on local food supplies. An exception was
10 made for I-131 in the diets of the 3-month and 1-year age
11 groups, where the entire intake over a sixty-day period was
12 assumed to be contaminated.

13
14 The nine radionuclides comprised five radionuclide groups,
15 each having common characteristics. The five groups are:
16 Sr-90; I-131; Cs-134 + Cs-137; Ru-103 + Ru-106; and Pu-238 +
17 Pu-239 + Am-241. An accident could involve more than one of
18 the five groups.

19
20 Protection of the more vulnerable segments of the population
21 and the practicality of implementation were major
22 considerations in the selection of the recommendations. These
23 considerations lead to the single DIL or the single criterion
24 for each radionuclide group that is presented in Table 2,
25 based on the most limiting Protective Action Guide (PAG) and

¹⁰ The "entire diet" includes tap water used for drinking.

1 age group for the radionuclide group.¹¹

2
3 The recommended DILs may be applied immediately following an
4 accident. Early identification of other radionuclides that
5 may be present in food is not required. However, the
6 recommended DILs should be evaluated as soon as possible after
7 an accident to ensure that they are appropriate for the
8 situation. Appendix E presents a discussion on DILs for a
9 number of other radionuclides that could be released from the
10 reactor core of a nuclear power plant.

11
12 (c) Imported or Exported Food

13
14 The LOCs that applied to radioactive contamination from the
15 Chernobyl accident in imported foods subject to FDA authority
16 were given in an FDA Compliance Policy Guide (FDA 1986b).
17 This guidance remains in effect and would be reviewed and
18 modified as necessary to respond to any future accident
19 resulting in radioactive contamination of imported food.

¹¹ The PAG of 5 mSv (0.5 rem) for committed effective dose equivalent was most limiting for Cs-134 + Cs-137 and Ru-103 + Ru-106; the PAG of 50 mSv (5 rem) for committed dose equivalent to a single specific tissue or organ was most limiting for Sr-90, I-131 and Pu-238 + Pu 239 + Am-241.

Table 2

Recommended Derived Intervention Level (DIL)
or Criterion for Each Radionuclide Group^{(a),(b)}

All Components of the Diet

Radionuclide Group	(Bq/kg)	(pCi/kg)
Sr-90	160	4300
I-131	170	4600
Cs-134 + Cs-137	1200	32,000
Pu-238 + Pu-239 + Am-241	2	54
Ru-103 + Ru-106 ^(c)	$\frac{C_3}{6800} + \frac{C_6}{450} < 1$	$\frac{C_3}{180,000} + \frac{C_6}{12,000} < 1$

Notes:

- (a) The DIL for each radionuclide group (except for Ru-103 + Ru-106) is applied independently (see discussion in Appendix D). Each DIL applies to the sum of the concentrations of the radionuclides in the group at the time of measurement.
- (b) Applicable to foods as prepared for consumption. For dried or concentrated products such as powdered milk or concentrated juices, adjust by a factor appropriate to reconstitution, and assume the reconstitution water is not contaminated. For spices, which are consumed in very small quantities, use a dilution factor of 10.
- (c) Due to the large difference in DILs for Ru-103 and Ru-106, the individual concentrations of Ru-103 and Ru-106 are divided by their respective DILs and then summed. The sum must be less than one. C_3 and C_6 are the concentrations, at the time of measurement, for Ru-103 and Ru-106, respectively (see discussion in Appendix D).

1 Food exported from the United States is controlled by
2 standards, regulations and guidance in the importing
3 countries. Two examples of guidance applicable to
4 accidentally contaminated foods exported from the United
5 States are the guidelines issued by the CODEX Alimentarius
6 Commission of the Joint FAO/WHO Food Standards Program and the
7 regulations adopted by the Commission of the European
8 Communities (CEC). The DILs adopted by these two
9 organizations (presented in Appendix F) differ from each other
10 and from the FDA LOCs.

11 12 PROTECTIVE ACTIONS

13
14 Protective actions are steps taken to limit the radiation dose
15 from ingestion by avoiding or reducing the contamination that
16 could occur on the surface of, or be incorporated into, human
17 food and animal feeds. Such actions can be taken prior to and/or
18 after confirmation of contamination. The protective actions for
19 a specific accident are determined by the particulars of the
20 situation and once initiated they continue at least until the
21 concentrations are expected to remain below the DILs.

22
23 For contamination events not effectively managed using DILs,
24 protective actions appropriate to the situation would still be
25 established and applied by the responsible officials. For
26 example, in 1988 FDA developed guidance for use in responding to
27 a contamination event that could have occurred from an

1 uncontrolled reentry of the Russian satellite Cosmos 1900. FDA
2 issued an advisory which specified protective actions against
3 contamination in the form of widely but sparsely distributed
4 discrete radioactive particulates and large pieces of radioactive
5 debris (FDA 1988). The uncontrolled reentry of Cosmos 1900 did
6 not occur.

7
8 (a) Protective Actions Prior to Confirmation of Contamination

9
10 Protective actions which can be taken within the area likely
11 to be affected and prior to confirmation of contamination
12 consist of:

- 13
- 14 • simple precautionary actions to avoid or reduce the
15 potential for contamination of food and animal feeds,
16 and
17
 - 18 • temporary embargoes to prevent the introduction into
19 commerce of food which is likely to be contaminated.
- 20

21 Protective actions can be taken before the release or
22 arrival of contamination if there is advance knowledge that
23 radionuclides may accidentally contaminate the environment.

24
25 For some types of accidents, determination of when and what
26 protective actions would be taken may be facilitated by

1 associating them with the accident classifications
2 designated by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) or the
3 Department of Energy (DOE). For accidents involving
4 commercial nuclear power reactors, the NRC has established
5 four emergency classes: Notification of Unusual Event,
6 Alert, Site Area Emergency, and General Emergency. Criteria
7 for declaring these classes were published by the NRC
8 (NRC 1980, 1991).

9
10 For accidents at DOE facilities, the DOE has established
11 three emergency classes: Alert, Site Area Emergency, and
12 General Emergency. These classes are comparable to those
13 established by NRC. Incidents considered as Unusual Events
14 by NRC licensees are covered as Unusual Occurrences by DOE
15 (DOE 1992).

16
17 Simple precautionary actions include modest adjustment of
18 normal operations prior to arrival of contamination. These
19 will not guarantee contamination in food will be below the
20 DILs but the severity of the forthcoming problem would be
21 significantly reduced. Typical precautionary actions
22 include covering exposed products, moving animals to
23 shelter, corralling livestock and providing protected feed
24 and water.

25
26 Precautionary actions should be implemented so as to avoid
27 placing in jeopardy persons implementing the action. For

1 example, in the case of an accident involving a commercial
2 nuclear power plant, if the predictions of the magnitude of
3 future off-site contamination are persuasive, precautionary
4 actions that could be taken and completed before a
5 declaration of Site Area Emergency or General Emergency
6 could be considered. However, precautionary actions that
7 would involve persons either not seeking shelter or leaving
8 the immediate vicinity of shelter should not be taken after
9 declaration of a Site Area Emergency or General Emergency.
10 A temporary embargo on food and agricultural products
11 (including animal feeds) prevents the consumption of food
12 that is likely to be contaminated. Distribution and use of
13 possibly contaminated food and animal feeds is halted until
14 the situation can be evaluated and monitoring and control
15 actions instituted. Temporary embargoes are applied when
16 the concentrations are not yet known. Because there is
17 potential for negative impact on the community,
18 justification for this action must be significant. The
19 embargo should remain in effect at least until results are
20 obtained. For nuclear power plants, a temporary embargo
21 should be issued only upon declaration of a General
22 Emergency and if predictions of the extent and magnitude of
23 the off-site contamination are persuasive. The geographical
24 area under control by the embargo would depend on the
25 accident sequence, the meteorological conditions, and the
26 food affected.

1 (b) Protective Actions for Foods Confirmed to be Contaminated

2
3 Protective actions which should be implemented when the
4 contamination in food equals or exceeds the DILs consist of:

- 5
- 6 • temporary embargoes to prevent the contaminated food
7 from being introduced into commerce, and
8
 - 9 • normal food production and processing actions that reduce
10 the amount of contamination in or on food to below the
11 DILs.
- 12

13 A temporary embargo to prevent the introduction into commerce
14 of food from a contaminated area should be considered when
15 the amount of contamination equals or exceeds the DILs or
16 when the presence of contamination is confirmed, but the
17 concentrations are not yet known. The temporary embargo
18 would continue until measurements confirm that concentrations
19 are below the DILs.

20

21 Normal food production and processing procedures that could
22 reduce the amount of radioactive contamination in or on the
23 food could be simple, (e.g., such as holding to allow for
24 radioactive decay, or removal of surface contamination by
25 brushing, washing, or peeling) or could be complex (Grauby
26 and Luykx 1990, FDA 1982, USDA 1989). The blending of

1 contaminated food with uncontaminated food is not permitted
2 because this is a violation of the Federal Food, Drug and
3 Cosmetic Act (FDA 1991).
4

5 Protective actions focus on the specific foods having the
6 greatest sources of radiation dose to the population.
7 Factors that determine which foods are most significant
8 include the agricultural practices in the area of
9 contamination and the stage of the growing or harvest season
10 at the time of the accident. In general, foods consumed
11 fresh, such as milk, leafy vegetables, and fruit, are
12 initially most important. Grains, root crops, other produce,
13 and animal-derived food products are significant later as
14 they come to market.
15

16 Specific protective actions to be implemented following an
17 accident are not provided in these recommendations because
18 there is such a wide variety of actions that could be taken.
19 The protective actions would be determined by state and local
20 officials with assistance from the growers, producers, and
21 manufacturers.
22

23 (c) Protective Actions for Animal Feeds Confirmed as Contaminated 24

25 Protective actions to reduce the impact of contamination in
26 or on animal feeds, including pasture and water, should also
27 be taken on a case-by-case basis. Accurately forecasting

1 the transfer of radioactive contamination through the
2 agricultural pathway, from animal feed to human food, is
3 problematic. The forecast is influenced by many factors,
4 such as: the type of feed (e.g., fresh pasture, grain),
5 other intakes (e.g., other feeds, supplements), the chemical
6 form of the radionuclide, medications being administered,
7 the animal species, and the type of resulting human food
8 (e.g., milk, meat, eggs).

9
10 Protective actions that could be taken when animal feeds are
11 contaminated include the substitution of uncontaminated
12 water for contaminated water and the removal of lactating
13 dairy animals and meat animals from contaminated feeds and
14 pasture with substitution of uncontaminated feed.

15 Corralling livestock in an uncontaminated area could also be
16 effective. The protective actions would be determined by
17 State and local officials, with assistance from growers,
18 producers, and manufacturers.

1 APPENDIX A - GLOSSARY

3 absorbed dose -

4 the quotient of the mean energy imparted by ionizing
5 radiation, d_e , to matter of mass dm . unit: Gy (ICRU 1993)

7 averted dose -

8 the radiation dose saved by implementing a protective action.
9 It may be expressed in any of the relevant dose quantities.
10 (ICRP 1991b)

12 becquerel (Bq) -

13 the unit of radionuclide activity or expectation value of the
14 number of spontaneous nuclear transitions per unit of time.

15 $Bq = 1$ transition per second. Unit: $1/s$ (ICRU 1980)

16 The unit of radionuclide activity used in the previous FDA
17 guidance was the curie (Ci)¹². $1 Bq = 27 \times 10^{-12} Ci = 27$
18 picocuries (pCi).

20 committed dose equivalent (H_T) -

21 the dose equivalent accruing in an organ or tissue up to a
22 specified number of years after the intake of a radionuclide
23 into the body. In this document, committed dose equivalent is
24 always computed to age 70 years. Unit: Sv (ICRP 1984a)

¹² The International System of Units is used throughout the document. In this Glossary, the units that were used in previous FDA guidance are given as reference points for the reader in the definitions of the units "becquerel" and "sievert".

1 committed effective dose equivalent (H_E) -

2 committed dose equivalents to individual organs or tissues,
3 multiplied by weighting factors, then summed. In this
4 document, committed effective dose equivalent is always
5 computed to age 70 years. Unit: Sv (ICRP 1984a)

6
7 contamination -

8 radionuclides on or in food or animal feed as a result of an
9 accidental release.

10
11 concentration -

12 radionuclide activity concentration. Unit: Bq/kg; 1 Bq/kg =
13 27 pCi/kg.

14
15 Derived Intervention Level (DIL) -

16 concentration derived from the intervention level of dose at
17 which introduction of protective measures should be
18 considered. Unit: Bq/kg (IAEA 1985)

19
20 dose coefficient (DC) -

21 the conversion coefficient for committed dose equivalent or
22 committed effective dose equivalent per unit intake of
23 radionuclide activity. Unit: Sv/Bq (ICRP 1989)

1 dose equivalent¹³ (H_T) -

2 the product of the absorbed dose in an organ or tissue and the
3 quality factor. Unit: Sv (ICRU 1993)

4

5 effective dose equivalent¹² (H_E) -

6 sum of weighted dose equivalents for irradiated tissues or
7 organs.

8
$$H_E = \sum w_T H_T$$

9 where w_T is a weighting factor representing the proportionate
10 stochastic risk for tissue T, and H_T is the mean dose
11 equivalent received by tissue T. A list of tissues and their
12 weighting factors is given by ICRP (ICRP 1984a). Unit: Sv

13

14 gray (Gy) -

15 unit of absorbed dose. 1 Gy = 1 J/kg; 1 milligray (mGy) = 10^{-3}
16 Gy. (ICRU 1993) The unit of absorbed dose in previous FDA
17 publications was the rad. 1 Gy = 100 rad; 1 mGy = 0.1 rad.

18

19 intervention level of dose -

20 reference level of dose equivalent to an individual at which
21 introduction of protective actions should be considered.

22 Unit: Sv (ICRP 1977, ICRP 1984b)

¹³ In this document, dose equivalent and committed dose equivalent are synonymous, and effective dose equivalent and committed effective dose equivalent are synonymous, because they always refer to the general public, to radionuclides deposited in the body, and to values computed to age 70 years.

1 Level of Concern (LOC) -

2 concentration in an imported food, set by FDA after the
3 Chernobyl accident, below which unrestricted distribution in
4 U.S. commerce is permitted.

5
6 precautionary action -

7 action taken, prior to confirmation of contamination, to avoid
8 or reduce the potential for contamination of food and animal
9 feed.

10
11 protective action -

12 action taken to limit the radiation dose from ingestion by
13 avoiding or reducing the contamination in or on human food and
14 animal feeds.

15
16 Protective Action Guide (PAG) -

17 committed effective dose equivalent or committed dose
18 equivalent to an individual organ or tissue that warrants
19 protective action following a release of radionuclides.

20
21 quality factor -

22 modifying factor that weights the absorbed dose for the
23 biological effectiveness of the charged particles producing
24 the absorbed dose. (ICRU 1993)

1 sievert (Sv) -
2
3 unit of dose equivalent. 1 Sv = 1 J/kg; 1 millisievert (mSv)
4 = 10^{-3} Sv. (ICRU 1993) The unit of dose equivalent used in
5 previous FDA guidance was the rem. 1 Sv = 100 rem; 1 mSv =
6 0.1 rem.

1 APPENDIX B - INTERNATIONAL CONSENSUS ON INTERVENTION LEVELS OF
2 DOSE

3
4 In 1984, the International Commission on Radiological Protection
5 (ICRP) recommended basic principles for planning intervention in
6 the event of major radiation accidents and provided general
7 guidance on radiation dose levels for the implementation of
8 countermeasures (ICRP 1984b). The term "intervention level of
9 dose" is used by ICRP for these dose levels. The ICRP guidance
10 indicated that for any countermeasure there is a lower level of
11 radiation dose below which the introduction of the countermeasure
12 is unlikely to be warranted, an upper level of radiation dose
13 above which the countermeasure should almost certainly be
14 implemented, and when between these levels, the specifics of the
15 situation determine which actions (if any) would be taken. For
16 the control of food, ICRP indicated lower and upper levels of 5
17 mSv¹⁴ and 50 mSv, respectively, for committed effective dose
18 equivalent and 50 mSv and 500 mSv, respectively, for committed
19 dose equivalent to an individual organ or tissue (ICRP 1984b,
20 ICRP 1977).

21
22 Since 1984, a number of international organizations have provided
23 guidance dealing with the ingestion of radionuclides that was
24 consistent with the ICRP guidance. These organizations included

¹⁴ The International System of Units is used throughout this document. See Appendix A, Glossary, for equivalence to units used in previous FDA guidance.

1 the Commission of the European Communities (CEC), the Codex
2 Alimentarius Commission (CODEX), the Food and Agricultural
3 Organization of the United Nations (FAO), the International
4 Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA), the Nuclear Energy Agency of the
5 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (NEA), and
6 the World Health Organization (WHO). All have adopted 5 mSv
7 committed effective dose equivalent as the radiation dose level
8 above which intervention was recommended (CODEX 1989, FAO 1987,
9 IAEA 1986, Luykx 1989, NEA 1989, Waight 1988, WHO 1988). All
10 except CODEX also adopted 50 mSv committed dose equivalent to an
11 individual tissue or organ when that value is more limiting.

12
13 The ICRP has updated its general concepts on intervention in its
14 Publication 60 (ICRP 1991a). Additional advice for intervention
15 for protection of the public was provided in its Publication 63
16 (ICRP 1991b). The additional advice included an intervention
17 level of averted dose (10 mSv effective dose¹⁵ in a year) for
18 restriction of a single foodstuff. ICRP considered this level
19 appropriate for almost all cases, excepting when alternative food
20 supplies are not available or population groups might suffer
21 serious disruption of their food supply.

22
23 The ICRP approach recommended that in application of this
24 intervention level of averted dose, the net benefit of

¹⁵ Effective dose is the ICRP's revised formulation of effective dose equivalent, as described in its 1990 recommendations (ICRP 1991a).

1 withdrawing a particular foodstuff be made optimum, based on
2 knowledge of the local situation and other assumptions about the
3 monetary value assigned to the effective dose. The ICRP provided
4 an example of how to evaluate the optimum. Such a procedure
5 requires information that would not be available during the early
6 phases of an accident.

7
8 The FDA uses the principles in the general guidance provided by
9 ICRP in 1984 for the immediate response to a major radiation
10 accident, recognizing that at later stages, after the local
11 situation is stabilized and more clearly defined, the longer-term
12 intervention for food can be modified based on more detailed
13 evaluation of local conditions by local authorities. Therefore,
14 the PAGs for the ingestion pathway at the onset of an accident
15 are 5 mSv committed effective dose equivalent or 50 mSv committed
16 dose equivalent to an individual tissue or organ, whichever is
17 more limiting.

1 APPENDIX C - RADIONUCLIDES DETECTED IN FOOD FOLLOWING THE
2 CHERNOBYL NUCLEAR POWER PLANT ACCIDENT OF APRIL 1986

3
4 (a) Analyses of Imported Food by the United States and Canada

5
6 (1) I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137

7
8 Shortly after the accident at Chernobyl on April 26, 1986, the
9 FDA and FSIS of the USDA began sampling imported food for
10 analysis to determine radionuclide activity concentrations.
11 Regulatory actions were based on FDA Levels of Concern (LOCs)
12 and the FSIS Screening Levels which were developed in 1986 and
13 applied to I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137.

14
15 The regulatory results of FDA and FSIS import monitoring and
16 analyses are summarized in Table C-1¹⁶. The radionuclide
17 activity concentrations (concentrations) exceeded the FDA LOCs
18 (Cunningham et al 1992) in 23 out of 2600 (0.9%) food samples,
19 and exceeded the FSIS Screening Values (equal to the
20 LOCs) (Engel et al 1989, Randecker 1990) in 107 out of 6295
21 (1.7%) meat and poultry samples. In general, Cs-134 and
22 Cs-137 were the principal radionuclides detected by FDA and
23 FSIS in the imported foods analyzed. I-131 was significant
24 for only about two months. Cs-134 and Cs-137 were also the

¹⁶ The International System of Units is used throughout the document. See Appendix A, Glossary, for equivalence to units used in previous FDA guidance.

1 dominant radionuclides in imported foods analyzed by Canada
2 (NHW 1987). The European countries of the Nuclear Energy
3 Agency (NEA) also found that I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137
4 contributed most of the radiation dose from radionuclides
5 ingested with food contaminated by the Chernobyl accident (NEA
6 1987, NEA 1989).

7 8 (2) Radionuclides Other Than I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137 9

10 In addition to the radionuclides used for regulatory actions
11 (I-131, Cs-134 + Cs-137), a number of other radionuclides were
12 detected in imported food entering the U. S. and Canada. Of
13 these, the most commonly detected radionuclides were Ru-103,
14 Ru-106, Ba-140, Sr-90, Ce-144 and Zr-95. The results of FDA
15 and Canadian import sampling for the latter radionuclides are
16 summarized in Table C-2. The data supported the prediction
17 that I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137 were the most significant
18 radionuclides for screening of imported foods, and that the
19 other radionuclides were of significantly less importance.
20

21 During 1986, of about 500 imported samples monitored by FDA,
22 Ru-103 and Ru-106 were above the detection levels for 18
23 samples and Ba-140 was above the detection levels in 9 samples
24 (Cunningham et al 1992). These radionuclides were not
25 detected after 1986. Only selected samples were analyzed for
26 Sr-90. Two samples, containing relatively high amounts of
27 Cs-134 + Cs-137 were analyzed for Sr-90 in 1986. In the

1 following years, a total of 40 samples (those having Cs-134 +
2 Cs-137 in excess of 110 Bq/kg) were analyzed for Sr-90. The
3 Sr-90 was above the detection levels in all 42 samples.

4
5 For Canadian imported foods, Ru-103 was above detection levels
6 in 46 of 840 samples analyzed during 1986 and 1987, and below
7 detection levels in all samples analyzed later. Ru-106 was
8 above detection levels in 130 of 936 samples analyzed from
9 1986 through 1989 (Marshall 1992). Samples were analyzed for
10 Ce-144 and Zr-95 from 1987 through 1989. Out of 486 samples,
11 Ce-144 was above detection levels in 88 samples and Zr-95 was
12 above detection levels in 3 samples.

13
14 Concentrations in FDA and Canadian imported samples were
15 generally below 10% of the respective Derived Intervention
16 Levels (DILs) given in Appendices D and E. The main
17 exceptions were for Ru-106 in Canadian samples which ranged up
18 to 42% of the DIL.

19
20 The results of analysis for imported samples collected by the
21 U.S. and Canada are representative of collections distant from
22 the accident site. Therefore, not only was the food variety
23 relatively limited, but time delays between accident and
24 sample collection, processing effects, and selective screening
25 that exporters may have applied could have influenced the
26 findings. Consequently, findings from samples collected at
27 countries close to Chernobyl are most useful for U.S.

1 decision-makers responding to a domestic release because these
2 findings are more representative of a local contamination
3 event.

4
5 (b) Analyses of Foods Collected Locally at Central and Eastern
6 European Countries

7
8 In 1986, FDA received a variety of foods collected locally by
9 United States Embassy staff in Central and Eastern European
10 countries. A total of 48 samples from Bulgaria,
11 Czechoslovakia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Russia, and
12 Yugoslavia, were analyzed. Results for Ru-103, Ru-106, and
13 Ba-140 are summarized in Table C-3. The number of samples
14 above detection levels for each radionuclide is given with the
15 ranges of associated percentages relative to the DILs. I-131
16 and Cs-134 + Cs-137 (not shown) were also detected in most of
17 the samples. I-131 concentrations exceeded the DIL for 27
18 samples; while Cs-134 + Cs-137 exceeded the DIL for 2 samples.

19
20 Most of the 48 embassy samples were fresh vegetables. The
21 edible portions were leafy for 28 samples and roots, bulbs,
22 shoots, or seedlings for 12 samples. Ru-103 was above
23 detection levels in all vegetables, exceeding its DIL for 6
24 samples. Ru-106 was above detection levels in all vegetables,
25 exceeding its DIL for 14 samples. Ba-140 was above detection
26 levels in 19, but did not exceed its DIL in any vegetables
27 (maximum, 6.3% of DIL).

1 Other samples included 3 fresh fruit and 5 processed foods
2 (cheese, yogurt, ice cream, and 2 milk samples). Ru-106 was
3 above detection levels in all fruit (maximum, 14% of DIL) and
4 in 2 processed foods (maximum, 29% of DIL). Ru-103 and Ba-140
5 were above detection levels but did not exceed 2% of their
6 DILs in the fruit or processed food samples.

7
8 In September 1986, 28 samples of spices from Turkey and Greece
9 (not offered for import) were provided by the American Spice
10 Trade Association (ASTA) for testing by FDA. This set of
11 samples represented deposition at a distance comparable to
12 many of the Eastern European embassy samples but were analyzed
13 at a later time after the accident. FDA analyzed spices for
14 gamma-ray emitting radionuclides and Sr-90. Findings are
15 included in Table C-3. Following the advice of CEC (CEC
16 1989a) and CODEX (CODEX 1989) for minor foods, a dilution
17 factor of ten was applied to the concentrations for herbs,
18 spices and flavorings, because they will be consumed in very
19 small quantities.

20
21 Cs-134 + Cs-137 (not shown in Table C-3), Ru-103, Ru-106, and
22 Sr-90 were above detection levels in all samples. I-131 and
23 Ba-140 were below detection levels having undergone ten or
24 more half-lives of radioactive decay.

1 Ru-103, having decayed for over four half-lives, ranged to a
2 maximum of only 4.5% of its DIL while Sr-90, though having
3 decayed very little, reached 10% of the DIL in only 8 samples
4 (maximum, 30% of DIL). Ru-106 exceeded its DIL in 2 samples,
5 was 50% to 100% in 5, and 10% to 50% in another 17.

6
7 (c) Conclusions

8
9 The results support the expectation that concentrations of
10 I-131 and Cs-134 + Cs-137 would serve as the main indicators
11 of the need for protective actions for imported and local
12 food. However, concentrations of Ru-106 were consistently in
13 excess or at a significant fraction of the DIL, which suggests
14 that Ru-106 should also serve as an indicator, i.e. be
15 included as a principal radionuclide for nuclear reactor
16 incidents.

17
18 Also, for local samples of fresh vegetables harvested during
19 the first week of the incident, half of the samples had Ru-103
20 concentrations a significant fraction of the DIL and another
21 quarter of the samples had Ru-103 concentrations in excess of
22 the DIL. Consequently, it would be prudent to consider Ru-103
23 as a principal radionuclide for local deposition, particularly
24 in the early phase of a nuclear reactor incident.

25
26 Sr-90 did not exceed 11% of the DIL in imported food (Table
27 C-2). For the series of 28 local (ASTA) spice samples (Table

1 C-3), Sr-90 was less than 30% of its DIL (generally a lower
2 percent of the DIL than found for Ru-106 or Cs-134 + Cs-137).
3 Also, the analytical method for determination of Sr-90 in food
4 is lengthy compared to analysis for the gamma-ray emitting
5 radionuclides, such that protective actions based on the
6 concentration of Sr-90 could not be taken in a timely manner.
7 Therefore, Sr-90 would not be an effective indicator of the
8 need for protective actions in the early phase of a nuclear
9 reactor incident.

10
11 During the first year after an accident, concentrations in
12 local or imported food other than for I-131, Cs-134, Cs-137,
13 Ru-103 and Ru-106 are expected to be significant only when one
14 or more of these principal radionuclides has exceeded its DIL.
15 Therefore, the food would already have been subject to
16 protective action.

Table C-1

SUMMARY OF U.S. REGULATORY FINDINGS FOR IMPORTED FOOD
FOLLOWING THE CHERNOBYL ACCIDENT

Agency	Number of Samples Analyzed	Sampling Period	Number of Samples Contaminated Above Regulatory Limits ^(c)	
			I-131	Cs-134 + Cs-137
FDA ^(a)	2600	5/86-9/92	2	21
FSIS ^(b)	6295	5/86-10/88	-	107
Regulatory Limits ^(c)			300 Bq/kg	370 Bq/kg

(a) Food and Drug Administration

(b) Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of
Agriculture

(c) FDA: Levels of Concern FSIS: Screening Levels

Table C-2

Ru-103, Ru-106, Ba-140, Sr-90, Ce-144, AND Zr-95
IN IMPORTED FOOD SAMPLES^(a) (UNITED STATES AND CANADA)

Year	Number of Samples Analyzed ^(b)		Number of Samples with Measurable Concentration (Maximum Percent of Derived Intervention Level)							
			Ru-103 ^(c)		Ru-106 ^(c)		Ba-140	Sr-90	Ce-144	Zr-95
<u>United States (FDA)</u>										
1986	500 ^(d)	Herbs	2	(0.02)	2	(9)				
		Others	16	(1.3)	16	(6)	9 (1.9)	2 ^(e)	(8)	
1987	37 ^(f)	Herbs						24	(3)	
		Others						13	(11)	
1989	3 ^(f)	Herbs						3	(2)	
<u>Canada</u>										
1986	450 ^(d)	Herbs	26	(0.5)	13	(42)				
		Others	10	(0.5)	1	(3)				
1987	390 ^(d)	Herbs	10	(0.05)	75	(22)			58 (9)	3 (0.9)
		Others			2	(19)				
1988	76	Herbs			30	(10)			26 (4)	
1989	20	Herbs			9	(4)			4 (2)	

(a) For herbs (which include herbs, spices, and flavorings), a dilution factor of ten was applied to the concentrations. No dilution factor was applied for other foods.

(b) Number of samples analyzed for the featured radionuclides. Not equal to number of samples analyzed for principal radionuclides.

(c) The reported Ru-106 concentrations in FDA reports were usually the sum of Ru-103 + Ru-106. Values in this table are the individual Ru-103 and Ru-106 concentrations.

(d) Approximate number.

(e) Number of samples tested for Sr-90, one of which exceeded the 1986 LOC for Cs-134 + Cs-137.

(f) Only samples with Cs-134 + Cs-137 in excess of 0.3 of 1986 LOC were analyzed for Sr-90.

Table C-3

Ru-103, Ru-106, Ba-140, AND Sr-90
IN SAMPLES FROM U.S. EMBASSIES IN CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE
AND FROM THE AMERICAN SPICE TRADE ASSOCIATION (ASTA)

Number of Samples Analyzed	Number of Samples with Measurable Concentrations in 1986 (Range, as Percent of Derived Intervention Level)			
	Ru-103 ^(a)	Ru-106	Ba-140	Sr-90
EMBASSY SAMPLES:				
<u>Leafy Vegetables</u>				
28	28 (0.1-507)	28 (1-3500)	14 (0.1-6.3)	NA
<u>Non-leafy Vegetables</u>				
12	12 (1-222)	12 (9-1570)	5 (0.2-5.4)	NA
<u>Fruit</u>				
3	3 (0.3-1.4)	3 (4-14)	ND	NA
<u>Processed Food</u>				
5	2 (0.6-2)	2 (4-29)	3 (0.2-1.4)	NA
ASTA SAMPLES:				
28	28 (0.2-4.5)	28 (6-1640)	ND	28 (0.9-30)

(a) Embassy samples were received primarily in May and June 1986 and the ASTA samples in September 1986. Due to radioactive decay, the relative concentration of Ru-103 compared to Ru-106 is considerably lower for the ASTA samples than for the embassy samples.

NA - Not analyzed.

ND - Not detected.

1 APPENDIX D - DERIVATION OF RECOMMENDED DERIVED INTERVENTION
2 LEVELS

3
4 The Derived Intervention Level (DIL) for a specific radionuclide
5 is calculated as follows:

$$\begin{array}{l} 6 \qquad \qquad \qquad \text{PAG (mSv)} \\ 7 \text{ DIL (Bq/kg) = } \frac{\qquad \qquad \qquad}{\qquad \qquad \qquad} \\ 8 \qquad \qquad \qquad f \times \text{Food Intake (kg) } \times \text{DC (mSv/Bq)} \end{array}$$

9 Where:

10 DIL = Derived Intervention Level

11 PAG = Protective Action Guide

12 DC = Dose coefficient

13 Food Intake = Quantity of food consumed in an appropriate
14 period of time

15 f = Fraction of food intake assumed to be
16 contaminated

17
18 The recommended Protective Action Guides (PAGs) are 5 mSv¹⁷
19 committed effective dose equivalent, or 50 mSv committed dose
20 equivalent to individual tissues and organs, whichever is more
21 limiting. These PAGs are consistent with the consensus of
22 international organizations on the levels of radiation dose below
23 which ingestion pathway interventions are generally not
24 appropriate (see Appendix B).

¹⁷ The International System of Units is used throughout the document. See Appendix A, Glossary, for equivalence to units used in previous FDA guidance.

1 Dose coefficients (DCs) are given in Table D-1 and food intakes
2 are given in Tables D-2 and D-3. The fraction of food intake
3 assumed to be contaminated (f) equals 0.3, except for I-131 in
4 infant diets where f equals 1.0.

5
6 (a) Radionuclides

7
8 Based upon data on radionuclides in human food following the
9 Chernobyl accident, DILs for I-131, Cs-134, Cs-137, Ru-103 and
10 Ru-106 would facilitate application of food monitoring
11 programs following accidents involving nuclear reactors. For
12 accidents at nuclear fuel reprocessing facilities and nuclear
13 waste storage facilities, DILs for Sr-90, Cs-137, Pu-239, and
14 Am-241 would be used. For nuclear weapons accidents and
15 accidents involving radioisotope thermal generators (RTGs) and
16 radioisotope heater units (RHUs) used in space vehicles, DILs
17 for Pu-239 and Pu-238, respectively, would be used. The
18 selection of these radionuclides as the major contributors to
19 radiation dose through ingestion is consistent with
20 recommendations on DILs published by NEA, WHO, CODEX, and CEC
21 (NEA 1989, WHO 1988, CODEX 1989, CEC 1989b, IAEA 1994).

22
23 (b) Age Groups and Dose Coefficients (DCs)

24
25 The general population was divided into six age groups ranging
26 from infants to adults and corresponding to the age groups in
27 ICRP Publication 56 (ICRP 1989) for which ICRP has published

DCs. The age groups are 3 months, 1 year, 5 years, 10 years, 15 years, and adult. The radionuclides, age groups and dose coefficients used in the calculations are presented in Table D-1.

(c) Food Intake

Food intake included all dietary components including tap water used for drinking, and is the overall quantity consumed in one year, with exceptions in the period of time for I-131 ($T_{1/2} = 8.04$ days) and Ru-103 ($T_{1/2} = 39.3$ days). For these, the quantities consumed were for a 60-day period and a 280-day period, respectively, due to the more rapid decay of these radionuclides. The intake periods for I-131 and Ru-103 are the nearest whole number of days for decay of these radionuclides to less than 1% of the initial activities.

Dietary intakes were derived from a 1984 EPA report which presented average daily food intake by age and gender (EPA 1984a, EPA 1984b). The EPA intakes were based on data from the 1977-1978 Nationwide Food Consumption Survey published by the U. S. Department of Agriculture (USDA 1982, USDA 1983). The age groups and annual dietary intakes for various food classes and the total, calculated from data in the EPA report, are given in Table D-2.

1 The dietary intakes derived for the ICRP age groups for which
2 DCs are available, using the results in Table D-2, are
3 presented in Table D-3.

4
5 (d) Fractions of Food Intake Assumed to be Contaminated (f)

6
7 For food consumed by most members of the general public, ten
8 percent of the dietary intakes was assumed to be contaminated.
9 This assumption recognizes the ready availability of
10 uncontaminated food from unaffected areas of the United States
11 or through importation from other countries, and also that
12 many factors could reduce or eliminate contamination of local
13 food by the time it reaches the market¹⁸.

14
15 Use of ten percent of the dietary intake as the portion
16 contaminated was consistent with recommendations made by a
17 Group of Experts to the Commission of the European Communities
18 (CEC 1986a) and by the Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) of the
19 Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (NEA
20 1989). The NEA noted that modification of this value would be
21 appropriate if justified by detailed local findings.

22
23 FDA applied an additional factor of three to account for the
24 fact that sub-populations might be more dependent on local

¹⁸ In most situations, one would expect less than ten percent of the dietary intakes to be contaminated.

1 food supplies. Therefore, during the immediate period after a
2 nuclear accident, a value of 0.3 (i.e., thirty percent) is the
3 fraction of food intake that FDA recommends should be presumed
4 to be contaminated. If, subsequently, there is convincing
5 local information that the actual fraction of food intake that
6 is contaminated (f) is considerably higher or lower, there
7 will be adequate time for State and local officials to
8 determine whether to adjust the value of f (and therefore
9 adjust the values of the DILs) for the affected area.

10
11 For infants, (i.e., the 3-months and 1-year age groups) the
12 diet consists of a high percentage of milk and the entire milk
13 intake of some infants over a short period of time might come
14 from supplies directly impacted by an accident. Therefore, f
15 was set equal to 1.0 (100%) for the infant diet.

16
17 (e) Selection of Recommended Derived Intervention Levels

18
19 DILs are presented in Table D-4 for Sr-90, I-131, Cs-134,
20 Cs-137, Ru-103, Ru-106, Pu-238, Pu-239, and Am-241 for six
21 population age groups and applicable PAGs. To facilitate the
22 execution of food monitoring programs, two criteria were used
23 in selecting FDA's recommended DILs.

24
25 First, the most limiting DIL for either of the applicable PAGs
26 was selected for each of the nine radionuclides. These DILs
27 are presented in Table D-5 for each of the six age groups. In

1 addition, the average DIL is presented for the radionuclide
2 group Pu + Am, composed of Pu-238, Pu-239, and Am-241, and the
3 radionuclide group Cs, composed of Cs-134 + Cs-137. The three
4 radionuclides in the Pu + Am group deposit on the bone surface
5 and are alpha-particle emitters. The radionuclides in the Cs
6 group are deposited throughout the body and are beta-particle
7 and gamma-ray emitters. The average values are recommended
8 for these groups because the calculated DILs for radionuclides
9 in each group are similar.

10
11 The radionuclides Ru-103 and Ru-106 are chemically identical,
12 are deposited throughout the body, and are beta-particle and
13 gamma-ray emitters. However, their widely differing half
14 lives (i.e., 39.3 days and 373 days, respectively) result in
15 markedly differing individual DILs which do not permit simple
16 averaging. Instead, the concentrations of Ru-103 (C₃) and
17 Ru-106 (C₆) are divided by their respective DILs and are then
18 summed¹⁹. The sum must be less than one.

19
20 Therefore, $\frac{C_3}{DIL_3} + \frac{C_6}{DIL_6} < 1.0$ (equation D-1)
21

22 This assures that the sum of the separate radiation dose
23 contributions from the Ru-103 and Ru-106 concentrations will
24 be less than that required by the Protective Action Guide

¹⁹ Laboratories that are not equipped to resolve separately the concentrations for Ru-103 and Ru-106 should contact FDA for alternate procedures.

1 during the first year after an accident.

2
3 Second, there are dietary components which are common to all
4 six age groups. A principal example is fresh milk, for which
5 the consumer of particular supplies cannot be identified in
6 advance. Therefore, the most limiting DIL for all age groups
7 in Table D-5, for each radionuclide or radionuclide group,
8 was selected and is applicable to all components of the diet.

9
10 These DILs are presented in Table D-6 and were rounded to two
11 significant figures (one significant figure for the Pu + Am
12 group). These are the FDA's recommended DILs.

13
14 The DILs in Table D-6 apply independently to each radionuclide
15 or radionuclide group, because they apply to different types
16 of accidents, or in the case of a nuclear reactor accident, to
17 different limiting age groups. However, the DILs for Ru-103
18 and Ru-106 are used in equation D-1 to evaluate that criterion
19 for the radionuclide group Ru-103 + Ru-106.

20
21 The FDA recommended DILs in Table D-6 are given in Table 2 in
22 the main text, along with clarifying notes on application of
23 the DILs.

Table D-1

DOSE COEFFICIENTS (mSv/Bq) ^(a)

Radionuclide	Age Group					
	3 month	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-90 bone surface	1.0E-03	7.4E-04	3.9E-04	5.5E-04	1.2E-03	3.8E-04
Sr-90	1.3E-04	9.1E-05	4.1E-05	4.3E-05	6.7E-05	3.5E-05
I-131 thyroid	3.7E-03	3.6E-03	2.1E-03	1.1E-03	6.9E-04	4.4E-04
I-131	1.1E-04	1.1E-04	6.3E-05	3.2E-05	2.1E-05	1.3E-05
Cs-134	2.5E-05	1.5E-05	1.3E-05	1.4E-05	2.0E-05	1.9E-05
Cs-137	2.0E-05	1.1E-05	9.0E-06	9.8E-06	1.4E-05	1.3E-05
Ru-103	7.7E-06	5.1E-06	2.7E-06	1.7E-06	1.0E-06	8.1E-07
Ru-106	8.9E-05	5.3E-05	2.7E-05	1.6E-05	9.2E-06	7.5E-06
Pu-238 bone surface	1.6E-01	1.6E-02	1.5E-02	1.5E-02	1.6E-02	1.7E-02
Pu-238	1.3E-02	1.2E-03	1.0E-03	8.8E-04	8.7E-04	8.8E-04
Pu-239 bone surface	1.8E-01	1.8E-02	1.8E-02	1.7E-02	1.9E-02	1.8E-02
Pu-239	1.4E-02	1.4E-03	1.1E-03	1.0E-03	9.8E-04	9.7E-04
Am-241 bone surface	2.0E-01	1.9E-02	1.9E-02	1.9E-02	2.1E-02	2.0E-02
Am-241	1.2E-02	1.2E-03	1.0E-03	9.0E-04	9.1E-04	8.9E-04

(a) Dose coefficients are from ICRP Publication 56 (ICRP 1989). The committed effective dose equivalents or committed dose equivalents are computed to age 70 years.

Table D-2

ANNUAL DIETARY INTAKES (kg/y)^(a)

FOOD CLASS	AGE GROUP (years)									
	< 1	1-4	5-9	10-14	15-19	20-24	25-29	30-39	40-59	60 & up
Dairy	208	153	180	186	167	112	98.2	86.4	80.8	90.6
(fresh milk) ^(b)	(99.3)	(123)	(163)	(167)	(148)	(96.5)	(79.4)	(66.8)	(61.7)	(70.2)
Egg	1.8	7.2	6.2	7.0	9.1	10.3	10.2	11.0	11.4	10.5
Meat	16.5	33.7	46.9	58.4	69.2	71.2	72.6	73.4	70.7	56.3
Fish	0.3	2.5	4.0	4.9	6.1	6.8	7.6	7.1	8.0	6.3
Produce	56.6	59.9	82.3	96.0	97.1	91.4	99.1	102	115	121
Grain	20.4	57.6	79.0	90.6	89.4	77.3	78.4	73.7	70.2	67.1
Beverage	112	271	314	374	453	542	559	599	632	565
(tap water) ^(b)	(62.3)	(159)	(190)	(226)	(243)	(240)	(226)	(232)	(268)	
	(278)									
Misc	2.0	9.3	13.3	14.8	13.9	10.9	11.9	12.5	13.3	13.0
TOTAL ANNUAL										
INTAKE, (kg/y)	418	594	726	832	905	922	937	965	1001	930

(a) Computed from daily intake values in grams per day provided in (EPA 1984b). The total annual intakes are rounded to nearest 1 kg/y.

(b) Fresh milk is included in the dairy entry, and tap water used for drinking is included in the beverage entry. The total annual intakes (kg/y) for fresh milk and tap water are also each given separately in parentheses.

Table D-3
DIETARY INTAKES
FOR ICRP AGE GROUPS

ICRP AGE GROUP	ANNUAL INTAKE ^(a) (kg)	280-DAY INTAKE RUTHENIUM-103 (kg)	60-DAY INTAKE IODINE-131 (kg)
3 months	418	320	69
1 year	506	387	83
5 years	660	506	109
10 years	779	597	128
15 years	869	666	143
Adult	943	723	155

(a) The annual dietary intakes for the ICRP age groups were obtained by assigning or averaging the appropriate annual dietary intakes given in Table D-2 for the EPA age groups, as follows:

3 months: used <1
 1 year: average of <1 and 1-4
 5 years: average of 1-4 and 5-9
 10 years: average of 5-9 and 10-14
 15 years: average of 10-14 and 15-19
 Adult: average of 15-19, 20-24, 25-29, 30-39, 40-59, 60 and up

Table D-4

PAGs AND DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS^(a)
(individual radionuclides, by age groups)

Radionuclide	PAG (mSv)	Derived Intervention Levels (Bq/kg)					
		3 months	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-90 bone surface ^(b)	50	400	445	648	389	160	465
Sr-90	5	308	362	616	497	286	505
I-131 thyroid	50	196	167	722	1200	1690	2420
I-131	5	659	548	2410	4110	5540	8180
Cs-134	5	1600	2190	1940	1530	958	930
Cs-137	5	2000	2990	2810	2180	1370	1360
Ru-103	5	6770	8410	12200	16400	25000	28400
Ru-106	5	449	621	935	1340	2080	2360
Pu-238 bone surface	50	2.5	21	17	14	12	10
Pu-238	5	3.1	27	25	24	22	20
Pu-239 bone surface	50	2.2	18	14	13	10	9.8
Pu-239	5	2.9	24	23	21	20	18
Am-241 bone surface	50	2.0	17	13	11	9.1	8.8
Am-241	5	3.3	27	25	24	21	20

(a) Derived Intervention Levels were computed using dose coefficients from Table D-1, dietary intakes from Table D-3, and "f" as given below:

0.3 (except for I-131 in infant diets, i.e., the 3-month and 1-year age groups)

1.0 (I-131 in infant diets)

(b) The observed trend in Derived Intervention Levels for Sr-90 as a function of age, i.e. minimum values at 15 years, results primarily from the mass of exchangeable strontium in bone as a function of age (Leggett et al 1982).

Table D-5

DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS (Bq/kg)
(individual radionuclides, by age group, most limiting of either PAG)

Radionuclide	3 months	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-90	308	362	616	389	160	465
I-131	196	167	722	1200	1690	2420
Cs-134	1600	2190	1940	1530	958	930
Cs-137	2000	2990	2810	2180	1370	1360
Cs group ^(a)	1800	2590	2380	1880	1160	1150
Ru-103	6770	8410	12200	16400	25000	28400
Ru-106	449	621	935	1340	2080	2360
Pu-238	2.5	21	17	14	12	10
Pu-239	2.2	18	14	13	10	9.8
Am-241	2.0	17	13	11	9.1	8.8
Pu+Am group ^(b)	2.2	19	15	13	9.6	9.3

(a) Computed as: (DIL for Cs-134 + DIL for Cs-137)/2

(b) Computed as: (DIL for Pu-238 + DIL for Pu-239 + DIL for Am-241)/3

Table D-6

DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS (Bq/kg)
(radionuclide groups, most limiting of all diets)

Radionuclide Group	Derived Intervention Levels
Sr-90	160 (15 years)
I-131	170 (1 year)
Cs group	1200 (adult)
Ru-103 ^(a)	6800 (3 months)
Ru-106 ^(a)	450 (3 months)
Pu + Am group	2 (3 months)

(a) Due to the large differences in DILs for Ru-103 and Ru-106, the individual concentrations of Ru-103 and Ru-106 are divided by their respective DILs and then summed. The sum must be less than one.

1 APPENDIX E - DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS FOR OTHER RADIONUCLIDES
2 IN THE INVENTORY OF THE CORE OF AN OPERATING NUCLEAR REACTOR

3
4 After a reactor accident, radionuclides other than the principal
5 radionuclides may also be detected in the food supply, usually at
6 much lower concentrations (See Appendix C). However, in the
7 event other radionuclides are present in significant
8 concentrations, this Appendix presents Derived Intervention
9 Levels (DILs) for a number of other radionuclides commonly found
10 in a reactor core inventory.

11
12 The DILs for fifteen other radionuclides were determined by the
13 same procedure used in Appendix D. The Protective Action Guides
14 were also the same, i.e. 5 mSv²⁰ committed effective dose
15 equivalent, or 50 mSv committed dose equivalent to individual
16 tissues and organs.

17
18 Age groups and their related food intakes for one year were given
19 previously in Table D-3, Appendix D. Dietary intakes for seven
20 of the fifteen other radionuclides that have half-lives much less
21 than one year were computed for the periods of time (i.e. in
22 nearest whole number of days) required for the radionuclides to
23 decay to less than 1% of the initial activities. Table E-1 and
24 Table E-2 give the relevant data for these seven radionuclides.

²⁰ The International System of Units is used throughout the document. See Appendix A, Glossary, for equivalence to units used in previous FDA guidance.

Dose coefficients for seven of the fifteen other radionuclides included in this Appendix are provided in ICRP Publication 56 (ICRP 1989) for all six age groups. For the remaining eight radionuclides, DCs are available in NRPB Publication GS7 (NRPB 1987), but for only three age groups, i.e. 1-year, 10-year and adult. The more limited data in NRPB publication GS7 are supplemented as indicated in the next section.

Fractions of food intake assumed to be contaminated (f) are:

0.3 for all radionuclides except Te-132, I-133 and Np-239 in infant diets (i.e., the 3-month and 1-year age groups);
1.0 for Te-132, I-133 and Np-239 in infant diets.

SELECTION OF DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS

The dose coefficients in ICRP Publication 56 and NRPB Publication GS7 are for individual tissues and the effective dose equivalent, as formulated in ICRP Publication 26. ICRP has also developed dose coefficients for individual tissues and the effective dose, as formulated in ICRP publication 60. These latter dose coefficients were published in ICRP Publication 67 (ICRP 1993) and ICRP 72 Publication (ICRP 1996) for all six age groups. Review of all these DCs demonstrated that the trend for relative values of DCs with age for any given radionuclide or for radionuclides with common biokinetic characteristics and half lives is similar. Therefore, DCs for the missing 3-month,

1 5-year, and 15-year age groups were derived for the eight
2 radionuclides in NRPB Publication GS7, based on the trends
3 observed in the three sets of ICRP tables. Table E-3 presents
4 the derived DCs for these three age groups and the data from ICRP
5 Publication 67 or 72 used in the derivations. Table E-4 gives
6 the DCs used in computing the DILs for all fifteen radionuclides
7 presented in Table E-5. DILs have been rounded to two
8 significant figures (except one significant figure for Np-237 and
9 Cm-244).

10
11 In the same manner as for the principal radionuclides in Appendix
12 D, the most limiting Derived Intervention Level for a
13 radionuclide for either PAG is given in Table E-6 for each age
14 group. Then, the most limiting DIL for a radionuclide for each
15 age group is presented in Table E-7.

16
17 During the immediate period after a nuclear reactor accident,
18 decisions on protective actions for food may be required and may
19 need to be based on the general status of the facility or the
20 overall prognosis for worsening conditions. Once food monitoring
21 data is available, the recommended DILs or criterion for the
22 principal radionuclides I-131, Cs-134 + Cs-137, and Ru-103 +
23 Ru-106 recommended in Table 2 of the main text should be used.

24
25 The more complex radiochemical or gamma-ray spectrometric
26 analyses for the fifteen other radionuclides listed in this

1 Appendix would not be generally available. If other radionuclides
2 are subsequently detected in food, there will be adequate time to
3 review the data on the concentrations of the other radionuclides
4 to evaluate whether their contributions to radiation dose via
5 ingestion are unexpectedly high, and to determine whether
6 additional radionuclides should be controlled by their respective
7 DILs in Table E-7. The evaluation takes place with knowledge of
8 the radiation dose represented by the concentrations of the
9 principal radionuclides, which may already exceed one or more of
10 their DILs.

Table E-1

NEAREST WHOLE NUMBER OF DAYS FOR SHORT-LIVED RADIONUCLIDES
TO HAVE DECAYED TO LESS THAN 1% OF INITIAL ACTIVITY (A_0)

Radionuclide	Half-life		Nearest Whole Number Of Days to Decay to Less Than 1% of A_0
I-133	20.8	h	6
Np-239	2.36	d	16
Te-132	3.26	d	22
Ba-140	12.7	d	85
Ce-141	32.5	d	217
Nb-95 ^(a)	35.2	d	236
Sr-89	50.5	d	336

- (a) Applies to Nb-95 existing in core inventory of an operating reactor at the time of release. Nb-95 produced as a result of decay of released parent Zr-95 is accounted for in the treatment of Zr-95.

TABLE E-2

DIETARY INTAKES^(a,b) (kg)

ICRP AGE GROUP	ANNUAL INTAKE	Sr-89 336-DAY INTAKE	Nb-95 236-DAY INTAKE	Ce-141 217-DAY INTAKE	Ba-140 85-DAY INTAKE	Te-132 22-DAY INTAKE	Np-239 16-DAY INTAKE	I-133 6-DAY INTAKE
3 months	418	385	270	249	97	25	18	6.9
1 year	506	466	327	301	118	31	22	8.3
5 years	660	608	427	392	154	40	29	11
10 years	779	717	503	463	181	47	34	13
15 years	869	799	562	517	202	52	38	14
Adult	943	868	610	561	220	57	41	16

- (a) The annual intakes (from Table D-3) are for radionuclides which do not decay to less than 1% of initial activity within a year.
- (b) Time periods for intakes are for specified radionuclides (from Table E-1) which decay to less than 1% of the initial activity within a year.

Table E-3

DOSE COEFFICIENTS (mSv/Bq) DERIVED FOR THE 3-MONTH, 5-YEAR AND 15-YEAR AGE GROUPS^(a)
 NOT AVAILABLE IN NRPB PUBLICATION GS7, USING DATA IN ICRP PUBLICATIONS^(b)

RADIONUCLIDES ^(c)		REFERENCES USED	DOSE COEFFICIENTS BY AGE GROUP					
			3 months	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-89	H _E	NRPB GS7	3.0E-05	1.5E-05	7.7E-06	5.2E-06	3.5E-06	2.2E-06
Sr-89	E	ICRP 72	3.6E-05	1.8E-05	8.9E-06	5.8E-06	4.0E-06	2.6E-06
Y-91	LLI	NRPB GS7	3.3E-04	2.1E-04	1.1E-04	7.1E-05	3.8E-05	3.0E-05
Y-91	E	ICRP 72	2.8E-05	1.8E-05	8.8E-06	5.2E-06	2.9E-06	2.4E-06
Te-132	THY	NRPB GS7	4.6E-04	2.2E-04	1.3E-04	6.0E-05	3.5E-05	1.9E-05
Te-132	THY	ICRP 67	6.2E-04	3.0E-04	1.6E-04	7.1E-05	4.6E-05	2.9E-05
I-133	THY	NRPB GS7	9.6E-04	8.6E-04	5.0E-04	2.3E-04	1.5E-04	8.3E-05
I-133	E	ICRP 72	4.9E-05	4.4E-05	2.3E-05	1.0E-05	6.8E-06	4.3E-06
Ba-140	LLI	NRPB GS7	2.1E-04	1.8E-04	9.7E-05	6.0E-05	3.1E-05	2.6E-05
Ba-140	LLI	ICRP 67	2.2E-04	1.9E-04	9.9E-05	5.7E-05	3.1E-05	2.9E-05
Ce-141	LLI	NRPB GS7	9.3E-05	6.0E-05	3.3E-05	2.0E-05	1.2E-05	8.7E-06
Ce-141	LLI	ICRP 67	9.8E-05	6.3E-05	3.2E-05	1.9E-05	1.1E-05	8.7E-06
Cm-242	BS	NRPB GS7	2.1E-02	2.6E-03	1.4E-03	8.9E-04	5.6E-04	4.5E-04
Cm-242	E	ICRP 72	5.9E-04	7.5E-05	3.9E-05	2.4E-05	1.5E-05	1.2E-05
Cm-244	BS	NRPB GS7	2.5E-01	2.5E-02	1.6E-02	1.2E-02	9.9E-03	9.8E-03
Cm-244	E	ICRP 72	2.9E-03	2.9E-04	1.9E-04	1.4E-04	1.2E-04	1.2E-04

(a) The dose coefficients (DCs) derived for age groups not available in NRPB Publication GS7 are indicated in bold font.

(b) The derived DCs were obtained by multiplying the DC for the NRPB age group contiguous to the missing NRPB age group by the following: the ratio of the DC for the desired age group to the DC of the contiguous age group, from the supporting ICRP data. When there were two contiguous age groups (i.e. for the 5-year and 15-year age groups), the two resulting DCs for the missing NRPB age groups were averaged.

(c) The dose quantity used is noted for each radionuclide. LLI is lower large intestine, THY is thyroid, BS is bone surface, H_E is effective dose equivalent, and E is effective dose.

Table E-4

DOSE COEFFICIENTS (mSv/Bq) ^(a)

Radionuclides		AGE GROUP					
		3 months	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-89	lower large intestine	2.8E-05	1.4E-04	7.1E-05	4.8E-05	2.3E-05	2.1E-05
Sr-89		3.0E-05	1.5E-05	7.7E-06	5.2E-06	3.5E-06	2.2E-06
Y-91	lower large intestine	3.3E-04	2.1E-04	1.1E-04	7.1E-05	3.8E-05	3.0E-05
Y-91		2.8E-05	1.7E-05	8.8E-06	5.7E-06	3.1E-06	2.4E-06
Zr-95		1.0E-05	6.6E-06	3.6E-06	2.2E-06	1.4E-06	1.1E-06
Nb-95		5.2E-06	3.7E-06	2.1E-06	1.3E-06	8.6E-07	6.8E-07
Te-132	thyroid	4.6E-04	2.2E-04	1.3E-04	6.0E-05	3.5E-05	1.9E-05
Te-132		3.0E-05	1.9E-05	1.1E-05	6.4E-06	3.4E-06	2.0E-06
I-129	thyroid	3.7E-03	4.3E-03	3.5E-03	3.8E-03	2.8E-03	2.1E-03
I-129		1.1E-04	1.3E-04	1.0E-04	1.1E-04	8.4E-05	6.4E-05
I-133	thyroid	9.6E-04	8.6E-04	5.0E-04	2.3E-04	1.5E-04	8.3E-05
I-133		2.9E-05	2.6E-05	1.8E-05	7.0E-06	4.3E-06	2.5E-06
Ba-140	lower large intestine	2.1E-04	1.8E-04	9.7E-05	6.0E-05	3.1E-05	2.6E-05
Ba-140		2.5E-05	1.4E-05	7.6E-06	5.1E-06	3.7E-06	2.3E-06
Ce-141	lower large intestine	9.3E-05	6.0E-05	3.3E-05	2.0E-05	1.1E-05	8.7E-06
Ce-141		7.8E-06	4.9E-06	2.5E-06	1.6E-06	9.0E-07	7.0E-07
Ce-144	lower large intestine	7.6E-04	4.9E-04	2.4E-04	1.5E-04	8.2E-05	6.6E-05
Ce-144		8.0E-05	4.3E-05	2.1E-05	1.3E-05	7.2E-06	5.8E-06
Np-237	bone surface	1.0E-01	8.9E-03	9.3E-03	9.9E-03	1.2E-02	1.2E-02
Np-237		5.5E-03	4.9E-04	4.3E-04	4.0E-04	4.7E-04	4.5E-04
Np-239	lower large intestine	9.8E-05	6.4E-05	3.2E-05	1.9E-05	1.1E-05	8.8E-06
Np-239		9.6E-06	6.3E-06	3.2E-06	1.9E-06	1.1E-06	8.7E-07
Pu-241	bone surface	3.3E-03	3.4E-04	3.5E-04	3.9E-04	3.9E-04	3.7E-04
Pu-241		2.2E-04	2.2E-05	2.1E-05	2.0E-05	2.0E-05	1.9E-05
Cm-242	bone surface	2.1E-02	2.6E-03	1.4E-03	8.9E-04	5.6E-04	4.5E-04
Cm-242		1.4E-03	1.8E-04	9.8E-05	6.4E-05	3.8E-05	3.0E-05
Cm-244	bone surface	2.5E-01	2.5E-02	1.6E-02	1.2E-02	9.9E-03	9.8E-03
Cm-244		1.4E-02	1.4E-03	9.2E-04	6.7E-04	5.9E-04	5.4E-04

(a) When dose coefficients were available from ICRP Publication 56 (ICRP 1989), they were given for all six age groups. When dose coefficients were available only from NRPB GS7 (NRPB 1987), they were given for only three age groups (i.e. 1 year, 10 years, and adult), and derived for the other three age groups (see Table E-3). The committed effective dose equivalents or committed dose equivalents are computed to age 70 years.

TABLE E-5

PAG AND DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS
(individual radionuclides, all age groups)^(a)

Radionuclide		PAG (mSv)	3 months	1 year	Derived Intervention Levels (Bq/kg)				Adult
					5 years	10 years	15 years		
Sr-89	lower large intestine	50	1600	2600	3900	4800	9100		9100
Sr-89		5	1400	2400	3600	4500	5800		8700
Y-91	lower large intestine	50	1200	1600	2300	3000	5300		5900
Y-91		5	1500	1900	2900	3800	6200		7400
Zr-95		5	4000	5000	7000	9700	14000		16000
Nb-95		5	12000	14000	19000	26000	35000		40000
Te-132	thyroid	50	4400	7300	35000	59000	89000		150000
Te-132		5	6700	8500	38000	55000	94000		150000
I-129	thyroid	50	110	76	72	56	69		84
I-129		5	360	250	250	200	230		280
I-133	thyroid	50	7600	7000	30000	56000	79000		130000
I-133		5	25000	23000	84000	180000	280000		420000
Ba-140	lower large intestine	50	8200	7900	11000	15000	27000		29000
Ba-140		5	6900	10000	14000	18000	22000		33000
Ce-141	lower large intestine	50	7200	9200	13000	18000	27000		34000
Ce-141		5	8600	11000	17000	23000	36000		43000
Ce-144	lower large intestine	50	530	670	1100	1400	2300		2700
Ce-144		5	500	770	1200	1700	2700		3100
Np-237	bone surface	50	4	37	27	22	16		15
Np-237		5	7	67	59	54	41		39
Np-239	lower large intestine	50	28000	36000	180000	260000	400000		460000
Np-239		5	29000	36000	180000	260000	400000		470000
Pu-241	bone surface	50	120	970	720	550	490		480
Pu-241		5	180	1500	1200	1100	960		930
Cm-242	bone surface	50	19	130	180	240	340		390
Cm-242		5	29	180	260	330	510		590
Cm-244	bone surface	50	2	13	16	18	19		18
Cm-244		5	3	24	27	32	33		33

^(a) Derived Intervention Levels were computed using dose coefficients from Table E-4, dietary intakes from

Table E-2 and "f" as given below:

0.3 (except for I-133, Te-132 and Np-239 in infant diets, i.e., the 3-month and 1-year age groups)

1.0 for I-133, Te-132 and Np-239 in infant diets

TABLE E-6

DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS (Bq/kg)

Most limiting of Derived Intervention Levels for 5 mSv H_E or 50 mSv H_T
(individual radionuclides, by age group)

Radionuclide	3 months	1 year	5 years	10 years	15 years	Adult
Sr-89	1400	2400	3600	4500	5800	8700
Y-91	1200	1600	2300	3000	5300	5900
Zr-95	4000	5000	7000	9700	14000	16000
Nb-95	12000	14000	19000	26000	35000	40000
Te-132	4400	7300	35000	55000	89000	150000
I-129	110	76	72	56	68	84
I-133	7600	7000	30000	56000	79000	130000
Ba-140	6900	7900	11000	15000	27000	29000
Ce-141	7200	9200	12000	18000	29000	34000
Ce-144	500	670	1100	1400	2300	2700
Np-237	4	37	27	22	16	15
Np-239	28000	36000	180000	260000	400000	460000
Pu 241	120	970	720	550	490	480
Cm-242	19	130	180	240	340	390
Cm-244	2	13	16	18	19	18

TABLE E-7

DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS (Bq/kg)

(radionuclide groups, most limiting of all diets)

Radionuclide Group	Derived Intervention Level	
Sr-89	1400	(3 months)
Y-91	1200	(3 months)
Zr-95	4000	(3 months)
Nb-95	12000	(3 months)
Te-132	4400	(3 months)
I-129	56	(10 years)
I-133	7000	(1 year)
Ba-140	6900	(3 months)
Ce-141	7200	(3 months)
Ce-144	500	(3 months)
Np-237	4	(3 months)
Np-239	28000	(3 months)
Pu-241	120	(3 months)
Cm-242	19	(3 months)
Cm-244	2	(3 months)

1 APPENDIX F - DERIVED INTERVENTION LEVELS ADOPTED BY THE
2 COMMISSION OF THE EUROPEAN COMMUNITIES AND THE CODEX ALIMENTARIUS
3 COMMISSION FOR INTERNATIONAL TRADE
4

5 Foods exported from the U.S. are subject to the criteria used by
6 the importing country, such as the recommendations of the CODEX
7 Alimentarius Commission (CODEX) or the regulations of the
8 Commission of the European Communities (CEC). CODEX is operated
9 by the Joint Food Standards Programme of the Food and Agriculture
10 Organization of the United Nations (FAO) and World Health
11 Organization (WHO). CODEX develops and recommends standards and
12 other guidance which are widely used in international trade. CEC
13 regulations govern trade within the European Economic Community
14 (EEC) and between the EEC and other countries. U.S. food
15 exporters need to be familiar with the guidance from these
16 organizations.

17
18 A discussion of CEC and CODEX Derived Intervention Levels
19 (DILs)²¹ is given below to provide insight into their
20 differences.

21
22 (a) Commission of The European Communities: DILs for Future
23 Accidents

²¹ The International System of Units is used throughout the document. See Appendix A, Glossary, for equivalence to units used in previous FDA guidance.

1 The CEC adopted regulations in 1987 and 1989, establishing
2 DILs for human food and animal feeds following a nuclear
3 accident or any other case of radiological emergency (CEC
4 1987, 1989a, 1989b). These were established for use
5 following any future accident and do not apply to residual
6 contamination from the accident at Chernobyl. DILs
7 addressing radioactive contamination from the Chernobyl
8 accident were adopted by the CEC in 1986 (CEC 1986b).
9

10 The DILs for foods contaminated by future accidents are
11 presented in Table F-1. DILs were given for four
12 radionuclide groups and four food categories. The
13 radionuclide groups include: isotopes of strontium, notably
14 Sr-90; isotopes of iodine, notably I-131; alpha-emitting
15 isotopes of plutonium and transplutonium elements, notably
16 Pu-239 and Am-241; and all other radionuclides of half-life
17 greater than 10 days, notably Cs-134 and Cs-137. For each
18 group, CEC specified DILs for four food categories: baby
19 foods, dairy produce, other food except minor food, and
20 liquid foods.
21

22 Baby foods were defined as "foodstuffs intended for the
23 feeding of infants during the first four to six months of
24 life, ... and are put up for sale in packages which are
25 clearly identified and labeled food preparation for infants".
26 Dairy produce, liquid food, and minor foods were defined by
27 reference to specific CEC regulations and nomenclature.

1 Liquid foods included tap water and the CEC stated the "same
2 values should be applied to drinking water supplies at the
3 discretion of competent authorities of member states". Dried
4 products referred to the products as prepared for
5 consumption. Dilution factors were not specified and the CEC
6 permitted member states to specify the dilution conditions.

7
8 DILs for minor foods such as spices were established, in a
9 separate regulation, at ten times the DILs specified for
10 "other foods" (CEC 1989a). Each DIL is to be applied
11 independently. However, for each radionuclide group, the
12 concentrations within the group are to be added when more
13 than one radionuclide is present. The DILs are to be
14 reviewed within three months following an accident to
15 determine if they should be continued.

16
17 (b) CODEX Alimentarius Commission: DILS for Use in International
18 Trade

19
20 CODEX adopted guidance in 1989 establishing DILs for food
21 contaminated with radionuclides. The CODEX DILs were issued
22 as guideline levels following an accidental nuclear
23 contamination event (CODEX 1989). The guidance was developed
24 from earlier publications of FAO (FAO 1987, Lupien and
25 Randall 1988) and WHO (Waight 1988, WHO 1988). The DILs are
26 presented in Table F-2. They were given for several

1 radionuclide groups categorized by the magnitude of their
2 dose coefficients and two food groups.

3
4 The food groups are milk and infant foods and foods destined
5 for general consumption. CODEX defined infant food as a food
6 prepared specifically for consumption by infants in the first
7 year of life and stated that such foods are packaged and
8 identified as being for this purpose (CODEX 1989). The
9 radionuclides were grouped according to the magnitude of
10 their dose coefficients (DCs). The specific groupings
11 differed for the two food groups. CODEX listed
12 representative radionuclides for each DC group. CODEX
13 guidelines were not restricted to these radionuclides; any
14 radionuclide can be placed into the appropriate DC group.

15
16 CODEX DILs apply for one year following a nuclear accident.
17 They are intended to be applied to food prepared for
18 consumption. Each DIL is to be applied independently.
19 However, for each, the concentrations within the group are to
20 be added. No guidance is provided for foods which are
21 consumed in small quantities, although CODEX stated that
22 application of the DILs to products of this type may be
23 unnecessarily restrictive (CODEX 1989).

Table F-1

DILs ADOPTED BY CEC FOR FUTURE ACCIDENTS^(a) (CEC 1989b)

Radionuclide Group	Derived Baby Foods	Intervention Dairy Produce	Levels (Bq/kg) Other Foods except minor foods	Liquid Foods
Isotopes of strontium, notably Sr-90	75	125	750	125
Isotopes of iodine, notably I-131	150	500	2000	500
Alpha-emitting isotopes of Pu and transplutonium elements, notably Pu-239, Am-241	1	20	80	20
All other radionuclides of half-life greater than 10 days, notably Cs-134, Cs-137	400	1000	1250	1000

(a) Do not apply to residual contamination from the accident at Chernobyl.

Table F-2

DIL VALUES RECOMMENDED BY CODEX (CODEX 1989)

FOODS DESTINED FOR GENERAL CONSUMPTION

Approximate Dose Coefficient (Sv/Bq)	Representative Radionuclides	DIL (Bq/kg)
10^{-6}	Am-241, Pu-239	10
10^{-7}	Sr-90	100
10^{-8}	I-131, Cs-134, Cs-137	1000

MILK AND INFANT FOODS

Approximate Dose Coefficient (Sv/Bq)	Representative Radionuclides	DIL (Bq/kg)
10^{-5}	Am-241, Pu-239	1
10^{-7}	I-131, Sr-90	100
10^{-8}	Cs-134, Cs-137	1000

1 **REFERENCES**

2
3 (Burnett and Rosenstein 1989) Burnett, B. M.; Rosenstein, M.
4 Status of U.S. Recommendations for Control of Accidental
5 Radioactive Contamination of Human Food and Animal Feeds. In:
6 Environmental Contamination Following a Major Nuclear Accident,
7 proceedings of an International Atomic Energy Agency Symposium.
8 Vienna: IAEA; IAEA-SM-306/34; 1989:379-388.

9
10 (CEC 1986a) Commission of the European Communities. Derived
11 Reference Levels as a basis For the control of foodstuffs
12 following a nuclear accident. A recommendation from the Group of
13 Experts set up under Article 31 of the Euratom Treaty. Brussels;
14 1986.

15
16 (CEC 1986b) Commission of the European Communities. Council
17 Regulation (EEC) No. 1707/86 of 30 May 1986, on the conditions
18 governing imports of agricultural products originating in third
19 countries following the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear power
20 station. Official Journal of the European Communities L146:88-90;
21 1986.

22
23 (CEC 1987) Commission of the European Communities. Council
24 Regulation (Euratom) No. 3954/87 of 22 December 1987, laying down
25 maximum permitted levels of radioactive contamination of
26 foodstuffs and of feedingstuffs following a nuclear accident or

1 any other case of radiological emergency. Official Journal of the
2 European Communities L146:11; 1987.

3
4 (CEC 1989a) Commission of the European Communities. Council
5 Regulation (Euratom) No. 944/89 of 12 April 1989, laying down
6 maximum permitted levels of radioactive contamination in minor
7 foodstuffs following a nuclear accident or any other case of
8 radiological emergency. Official Journal of the European
9 Communities L101:17; 1989.

10
11 (CEC 1989b) Commission of the European Communities. Council
12 Regulation (Euratom) No. 2218/89 of 18 July 1989, amending
13 Regulation (Euratom) No. 3954/87, laying down maximum permitted
14 levels of radioactive contamination of foodstuffs and of
15 feedingstuffs following a nuclear accident or any other case of
16 radiological emergency. Official Journal of the European
17 Communities L211:1; 1989.

18
19 (CIRRPC 1992) Committee on Interagency Radiation Research and
20 Policy Coordination. Use of BEIR IV and UNSCEAR 1988 in
21 Radiation Risk Assessment, Lifetime Total Cancer Mortality rate
22 Estimates at low Doses and Low Dose Rates for Low-LET Radiation.
23 Science Panel Report No. 9; CIRRPC, Washington, D. C.; 1992.

24
25 (CODEX 1989) Codex Alimentarius Commission. Contaminants:
26 Guideline Levels for Radionuclides in Food following Accidental

1 Nuclear Contamination for Use in International Trade. Supplement1
2 to Codex Alimentarius Volume XVII, 1st ed. Rome: Joint FAO/WHO
3 Food Standards Programme; 1989.

4
5 (Cunningham et al 1992) Cunningham, W. C.; Anderson, D. L.;
6 Baratta, E. J. Radionuclides in Domestic and Imported Foods in
7 the United States, 1987-1992. Journal of the Association of
8 Analytical Chemists Vol. 77, No.6, pp. 1422-1427, 1994.

9
10 (DOE 1989) Department of Energy. Integrated Data Base for 1989:
11 Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Inventories, Projections, and
12 Characteristics. ORNL Contract No. DE-AC05-84OR21400.
13 Washington, D. C.: DOE/RW-0006, Rev. 5; 1989.

14
15 (DOE 1992) Department of Energy. Emergency Categories, Classes,
16 and Notification and Reporting Requirements. ORDER DOE 5500.2B
17 Change 1: 2-27-92; 1992.

18
19 (Engel et al 1989) Engel, R. E.; Randecker, V.; Johnson, W. Role
20 of the United States Food Safety and Inspection Service After the
21 Chernobyl Accident. In: Environmental Contamination Following a
22 Major Nuclear Accident, proceedings of an International Atomic
23 Energy Agency Symposium. IAEA; Vienna 1990 STI/PUB/825 (IAEA-SM-
24 306/19;371-378).

1 (EPA 1977) Environmental Protection Agency. Technical Support
2 of Standards for High-Level Radioactive Waste Management. Vol.A,
3 Source Term Management. Office of Radiation Programs. Washington,
4 D. C.: EPA 520/4-79-007A; 1977.

5
6 (EPA 1984a) Environmental Protection Agency. An Estimation of
7 the Daily Food Intake Based on Data from the 1977-1978 USDA
8 Nationwide Food Consumption Survey. Office of Radiation Programs.
9 Washington, D.C.: EPA 520/1-84-015; 1984.

10
11 (EPA 1984b) Environmental Protection Agency. An Estimation of
12 the Daily Average Food Intake by Age and Sex for Use in Assessing
13 the Radionuclide Intake of Individuals in the General Population.
14 Office of Radiation Programs. Washington, D.C.: EPA 520/1-84-021;
15 1984.

16
17 (EPA 1987) Environmental Protection Agency. Radiation
18 Protection Guidance to Federal Agencies for Occupational
19 Exposure. Federal Register 52: 2822-2834; 1987.

20
21 (FAO 1987) Food and Agriculture Organization of the UN. Report
22 of The Expert Consultation on Recommended Limits for Radionuclide
23 Contamination of Foods, December 1986. Rome: FAO/UN; 1987.

1 (FDA 1982) Food and Drug Administration. Accidental Radioactive
2 Contamination of Human Food and Animal Feeds: Recommendations for
3 State and Local Agencies. Federal Register 47:47073-47083; 1982.

4
5 (FDA 1986a) Food and Drug Administration. Radionuclides in
6 Imported Foods; Levels of Concern. Availability of Compliance
7 Policy Guide. Federal Register 51:23155; 1986.

8
9 (FDA 1986b) Food and Drug Administration. Radionuclides in
10 Imported Foods - Levels of Concern. Washington, D. C.: FDA;
11 Compliance Policy Guide No. 7119.14; 1986.

12
13 (FDA 1988) Food and Drug Administration. Advisory to FDA
14 Regulated Industries: Mitigation of Contamination From Reentry of
15 Cosmos 1900. FDA Meeting with Industry, 19 September 1988,
16 Rockville, MD: Associate Commissioner for Regulatory Affairs;
17 1988.

18
19 (FDA 1991) Food and Drug Administration. Code of Federal
20 Regulations. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office;
21 21 CFR Part 110.110(d); 1991.

22
23 (FRC 1960) Federal Radiation Council. Background Material for
24 the Development of Radiation Protection Standards. Washington,
25 D. C.: FRC; Report No. 1; 1960.

1 (FRC 1961) Federal Radiation Council. Background Material for
2 the Development of Radiation Protection Standards. Washington,
3 D. C.: FRC; Report No. 2; 1961.

4
5 (Grauby and Luykx 1990) Grauby, A.; Luykx, F. Radioactivity
6 Transfer During Food Processing and Culinary Preparation.
7 Proceedings of a Commission of the European Communities seminar,
8 18-21 September 1989, Cadarache, France: CEC; XI-3508/90; 1990.

9
10 (IAEA 1985) International Atomic Energy Agency. Principles for
11 Establishing Intervention Levels for the Protection of the Public
12 in the Event of a Nuclear Accident or Radiological Emergency.
13 Vienna; Safety Series No. 72; 1985.

14
15 (IAEA 1986) International Atomic Energy Agency. Derived
16 Intervention Levels for Application in Controlling Radiation
17 Doses to the Public in the Event of a Nuclear Emergency:
18 Principles, Procedures and Data. Vienna; Safety Series No. 81;
19 1986.

20
21 (IAEA 1994) International Atomic Energy Agency. International
22 Basic Safety Standards for Protection against Ionizing Radiation
23 and for the Safety of Radiation Sources, Interim Edition. Vienna;
24 Safety Series No. 115-I; 1994.

1 (ICRP 1977) International Commission on Radiological Protection.
2 Recommendations of the International Commission on Radiological
3 Protection. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP Publication 26: Ann.
4 ICRP 1(3); 1977.

5

6 (ICRP 1984a) International Commission on Radiological Protection.
7 A Compilation of the Major Concepts and Quantities in Use by
8 ICRP. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP Publication 42: Ann. ICRP
9 14(4); 1984.

10

11 (ICRP 1984b) International Commission on Radiological
12 Protection. Protection of the Public in the Event of Major
13 Radiation Accidents: Principles for Planning. Oxford: Pergamon
14 Press; ICRP Publication 40; Ann. ICRP 14(2); 1984.

15

16 (ICRP 1989) International Commission on Radiological Protection.
17 Age-dependent Doses to Members of the Public from Intake of
18 Radionuclides. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP Publication 56, Part
19 1; Ann. ICRP 20(2); 1989.

20

21 (ICRP 1991a) International Commission on Radiological
22 Protection. 1990 Recommendations of the International Commission
23 on Radiological Protection. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP
24 Publication 60; Ann. ICRP 21(1-3); 1991.

25

1 (ICRP 1991b) International Commission on Radiological
2 Protection. Principles for Intervention for Protection of the
3 Public in a Radiological Emergency. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP
4 Publication 63; Ann. ICRP 22(4); 1991.
5
6 (ICRP 1993) International Commission on Radiological Protection.
7 Age-dependent Doses to Members of the Public from Intake of
8 Radionuclides: Part 2 Ingestion Dose Coefficients. Oxford:
9 Pergamon Press; ICRP Publication 67; Ann. ICRP 23(3/4); 1993.
10
11 (ICRP 1996) International Commission on Radiological Protection.
12 Age-dependent Doses to Members of the Public from Intake of
13 Radionuclides: Part 5 Compilation of Ingestion and Inhalation
14 Dose Coefficients. Oxford: Pergamon Press; ICRP Publication 72;
15 Ann. ICRP 26(1); 1996.
16
17 (ICRU 1980) International Commission on Radiation Units and
18 Measurements. Radiation Quantities and Units. Washington, D. C.:
19 ICRU Report No. 33; 1980.
20
21 (ICRU 1993) International Commission on Radiation Units and
22 Measurements. Quantities and Units in Radiation Protection
23 Dosimetry. Washington, D. C.: ICRU Report No. 51; 1993.
24
25 (Leggett et al 1982) Leggett, R. W., Eckerman, K.F., Williams,
26 L. R. Strontium-90 in Bone: a Case Study in Age-Dependent

Dosimetric Modeling. Health Physics Vol. 43, No. 3, pp. 307-322;
1982.

(Lupien and Randall 1988) Lupien, J. R.; Randall, A. W. FAO
Recommended Limits for Radionuclide Contamination of Food. In:
Carter, M. W., ed. Radionuclides in the Food Chain. New York:
Springer-Verlag; 1988: 389-397.

(Luykx 1989) Luykx, F. Response of the European Communities to
Environmental Contamination Following The Chernobyl Accident. In:
Environmental Contamination Following a Major Nuclear Accident,
proceedings of an International Atomic Energy Agency Symposium.
Vienna: IAEA; IAEA-SM-306/120; 1989:269-287.

(Marshall 1992) Marshall, H.; Health and Welfare, Canada.
Personal Communication, Data Sheets. Ottawa; Department of
National Health and Welfare; 1992.

(NEA 1987) Nuclear Energy Agency. The Radiological Impact of the
Chernobyl Accident in OECD Countries. Paris: Organization for
Economic Co-operation and Development; 1987.

(NEA 1989) Nuclear Energy Agency. Nuclear Accidents:
Intervention Levels for Protection of the Public. Paris:
Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development; 1989.

1 (NHW 1987) Health and Welfare, Canada. Environmental
2 Radioactivity in Canada 1986. Ottawa; Department of National
3 Health and Welfare; 87-EHD-136; 1987.
4
5 (NRC 1975) Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Reactor Safety Study;
6 An Assessment of Accident Risks in U. S. Commercial Nuclear Power
7 Plants. Washington, D. C.; NUREG-75/014; 1975.
8
9 (NRC 1980) Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Criteria for
10 Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response
11 Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants.
12 Washington, D. C.; NUREG-0654, FEMA-REP-1, 1980.
13
14 (NRC 1996) Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Response Technical
15 Manual, RTM-96. Washington, D. C.; NRC Report NUREG/BR-0150, V1,
16 Rev. 4; 1996.
17
18 (NRPB 1987) National Radiological Protection Board. Committed
19 Doses to Selected Organs and Committed Effective Doses from
20 Intakes of Radionuclides. Chilton, Didcot, Oxfordshire: NRPB
21 Publication GS7; 1987.
22
23 (Randecker 1990) Randecker, V. Personal Communication.
24 Washington, D. C.: U. S. Department of Agriculture; June 1990.
25

1 (Schmidt 1988a) Schmidt, G. D. Impact of Chernobyl on Ingestion
2 Pathway Guidance. In: Proceedings of CRCPD 20th National
3 Conference on Radiation Control, 15-19 May 1988, Nashville, TN:
4 Conference of Radiation Control Program Directors, Inc.; CRCPD
5 Pub. 88-6; 1988:141-159.

6
7 (Schmidt 1988b) Schmidt, G. D. Development of Guidelines for
8 Safety Evaluation of Food and Water after Nuclear Accidents:
9 Procedures in North America. In: Carter, M. W., ed.
10 Radionuclides in the Food Chain. New York: Springer-Verlag; 1988:
11 365-380.

12
13 (Schmidt 1990) Schmidt G. D. Review of the 1982 FDA Protective
14 Action Recommendations with Regard to Revision. Report to the
15 Food and Drug Administration. February 1990: Rockville, MD: FDA
16 Office of Health Physics; 1990.

17
18 (Shleien et al 1982) Shleien, B.; Schmidt, G. D.; Chiacchierini,
19 R. P. Background for Protective Action Recommendations:
20 Accidental Radioactive Contamination of Food and Animal Feeds.
21 Washington, D. C.: U. S. Food and Drug Administration; FDA 82-
22 8196; 1982.

23
24 (USDA 1982) U. S. Department of Agriculture. Foods Commonly
25 Eaten by Individuals: Amount Per Day and Per Eating Occasion.

1 Washington, D. C.: Human Nutrition Service; Home Economics
2 Research Report No. 44; March 1982.
3
4 (USDA 1983) U. S. Department of Agriculture. Food Intakes:
5 Individuals in 49 States, Year 1977-1978. Washington D. C.: Human
6 Nutrition Service; National Food Consumption Survey 1977-78;
7 Report No. I-1; August 1983.
8
9 (USDA 1986a) U. S. Department of Agriculture. Radionuclide
10 Screening Values for Monitoring Meat Products. Washington, D. C.:
11 Food Safety and Inspection Service; 1986.
12
13 (USDA 1986b) U. S. Department of Agriculture. Meat Inspection -
14 Radiation Level Change. Washington, D. C.: Food Safety and
15 Inspection Service; 1986b.
16
17 (USDA 1989) U. S. Department of Agriculture. Radiological
18 Emergency Information for Farmers, Food Producers, and
19 Distributors. Washington D. C.: Food Safety and Inspection
20 Service; 1989.
21
22 (Waight 1988) Waight, P. J. The Development of WHO's Approach to
23 DILs. In: Carter, M. W., ed. Radionuclides in the Food Chain. New
24 York: Springer-Verlag; 1988: 381-388.

1 (WHO 1988) World Health Organization. Derived Intervention Levels
2 for Radionuclides in Foods - Guidelines for Application after
3 Widespread Radioactive Contamination Resulting from a Major
4 Radiation Accident. Geneva: WHO; 1988.